



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MN

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,004	11/26/2001	Stewart P. MacLeod	MS1-772US	S434
22801	7590	07/12/2007		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER MIRZA, ADNAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/12/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/995,004	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MACLEOD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Adnan M. Mirza	<b>Art Unit</b> 2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-34, 36-42, 44-52, 54, 73-76 and 78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-34, 36-42, 44-52, 54, 73-76 and 78 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-16,18-34,36-42,44-52,54,73-76,78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suarez (5,790,789) and Berg et al (U.S. 5,99,911).

As per claims 1,19,37 Suarez disclosed in a distributed computing environment, a computer-implemented method for dynamically implementing a workflow responsive to a state changes, of objects in directory, the directory comprising a network-based directory service providing storage and look up of objects corresponding to resources, the workflow comprising stored information defining a plurality of tasks and flow between the tasks, the method comprising: automatically mapping the state change to the object to the workflow; and executing one of the tasks of the work flow (col. 12, lines 36-64).

However Suarez did not disclose in detail automatically detecting a state change to an object in the directory; and responsive to detecting the state change.

Art Unit: 2145

In the same field of endeavor Berg disclosed, the flow management engine for maintaining and updating the state of a workflow any change in the state of the workflow to other workflow manager systems operating on the same workflow. By updating the state of the workflow instance in this manner all users working on the same instance of a workflow share the same view of the workflow (col. 7, lines 56-63).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated the flow management engine for maintaining and updating the state of a workflow any change in the state of the workflow to other workflow manager systems operating on the same workflow. By updating the state of the workflow instance in this manner all users working on the same instance of a workflow share the same view of the workflow as taught by Berg in the method of Suarez to reduce the amount of deficiencies in terms of automating the processes such as detecting and monitoring changes to states, also performing and managing complex processes resulted in reducing latency issues.

3. As per claims 2,20,38,56 Suarez -Berg disclosed wherein executing the tasks further comprises storing a change in state of the workflow corresponding to the one of the tasks (Suarez, col. 21, lines 4-14).

Art Unit: 2145

4. As per claims 3,21,39,57 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein executing the task further comprises executing an operation of a task of the plurality of tasks until convergence of a desired state is identified (Suarez, col. 22, lines 3-18).

5. As per claims 4,22,40,58 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein executing the task further comprises storing a sequence of operations based on the tasks (Suarez, col. 22, lines 3-18).

6. As per claims 5,23,41,59 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein executing the task further comprises storing information corresponding to one or more directory objects to which the workflow applies (Suarez, col. 21, lines 17-33).

7. As per claims 6,24,42,60 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein executing the task further comprises storing status information based on respective status of at least one other task of the workflow (Suarez, col. 22, lines 3-18).

8. As per claims 7,25,43,61 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein mapping the state change to the object to the work flow further comprises evaluating the state change to the object based on a declarative condition stored as a text string on an object instance of a content class defined by a schema (Suarez, col. 12, lines 36-64).

Art Unit: 2145

9. As per claims 8,26,44,62 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein one of the tasks comprises any combination of a declarative condition or an operation that is stored as a text string in an object corresponding to one of the tasks (Suarez, col. 21, lines 4-14).

10. As per claims 9,27,45,63 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein semantics of the workflow are based on a workflow schema (Suarez, col. 22, lines 3-18).

11. As per claims 10,28,46,64 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein semantics of the mapping of the state change to is the object to the workflow are based on an event association object schema (Suarez, col. 22, lines 3-18).

12. As per claims 11,29,47,65 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein at least some of the tasks are executed with respect to one another based on an order of execution relationship comprising a finish-start relationship, a parallel execution relationship, a precedence constraint relationship, or a task priority relationship (Suarez, col. 21, lines 17-33).

13. As per claims 12,30,48,66 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein at least some of the tasks are executed with respect to one another based on a precedence constraint relationship or a task priority relationship (Suarez, col. 21, lines 17-33).

14. As per claims 13,31,49,67 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein the method further comprises: monitoring a status corresponding to a task of the tasks; storing the status on a status

monitoring object; and wherein a content class in a directory schema defines the status monitoring object (Suarez, col. 14, lines 38-51).

15. As per claims 14,32,50,68 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein the method further comprises: monitoring a set of directory resources affected by the workflow; storing the directory resources on a status monitoring object; and wherein a content class in a directory schema defines the status monitoring object (Suarez, col. 21, lines 17-33).

16. As per claims 15,33,51,69 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein the method further comprises: monitoring a status corresponding to an operation of the workflow; determining that the status comprises a failure status; and responsive to the determining, taking a corrective action to advance the workflow in view of the failure status (Suarez, col. 14, lines 38-51).

17. As per claims 16,34,52,70 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein executing the task further comprises: updating a status corresponding to the task in the workflow; and evaluating the workflow to determine that a next task of the tasks needs to be implemented (Suarez, col. 22, lines 3-18).

19. As per claims 18,36,54 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein the tasks implement a policy with respect to one or more directory resources, and wherein mapping the state change to the object to the work flow further comprises automatically determining the workflow based on the policy (Suarez, col. 22, lines 3-18).

Art Unit: 2145

20. As per claim 73 Suarez-Berg disclosed a computer-readable medium comprising a workflow enabled directory schema for automated work flow implementation by a set of computer-program instructions executable by a processor, the workflow enable directory schema comprising a plurality of base object content classes, comprising: a provisioning service content class to detect an event corresponding to a state change in a directory object (Berg, col. 7, lines 56-63); a workflow content class for storing a sequence of tasks; an event association content class for storing declarative conditions to map the state change to the directory object to an object instance of the workflow content class (Suarez, col. 21, lines 17-33); and wherein the provisioning service content class is further configured to execute the sequence of tasks corresponding to the object instance (Suarez, col. 14, lines 38-51).

21. As per claim 74 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein at least a subset of the base object content classes comprise a respective flexible attribute data field that indicates a data type, the data type being used to express various operational or data providing properties of the flexible attribute, the various operational or data providing properties being independent of the data type and independent of any modification to the workflow enabled directory schema (Suarez, col. 14, lines 38-51).

22. As per claim 75 Suarez-Berg disclosed wherein the sequence of tasks comprises any combination of a declarative conditions and operations corresponding to directory-based objects (Suarez, col. 21, lines 17-33).



Art Unit: 2145

23. As per claim 76 Suarez-Berg disclosed further comprising a status monitoring content class for storing a status of an object instance of the workflow content class (Suarez, col. 21, lines 17-33).

24. As per claims 78 Suarez-Berg disclosed a computer-readable medium comprising a workflow enabled directory schema as recited (Suarez, col. 21, lines 17-33).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16,18-34,36-42,44-52,54,73-76,78 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

**25. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (571)-272-3885.

27. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business hours. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)-272-3933. The fax for this group is (703)-746-7239. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2145

28. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866)-217-9197 (toll-free).

*AM*

Adnan Mirza

Examiner

  
**JASON CARDONE**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER